

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/844,155	04/27/2001		Takashi Miyoshi	IIDAP10.001AUS	1776	
20995	7590	10/17/2003		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP				IP, SIK	IP, SIKYIN	
	2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA				1742	n-	
				DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003	IO	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/844,155	MIYOSHI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Sikyin Ip	1742					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearion for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin  pply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day  d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  ute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  /s will be considered timely.  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	3 July 2003 .						
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ 1	This action is non-final.						
Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	wance except for formal matters, pier <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the merits is 153 O.G. 213.					
4) $\boxtimes$ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application	n.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc							
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` *					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		oved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in r	• •						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	ı)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
Certified copies of the priority document							
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Applicati	on No					
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri</li> <li>application from the International B</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis</li> </ul>	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	·					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes							
attachment(s)							
) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 1742

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by JP 50077216 (abstract). JP 50077216 discloses Cu based alloy contains 0.8 wt.% Sn and 0.2 wt.% Ag. The tensile strength of the Cu alloy electric conductor is about 69 kg/mm² which is about 589.7 MPa and the electrical conductivity is about 59% IACS. The intended use statement in the preamble does not impart patentability to a claim to a composition substantially identical to that of the prior art. Ex Parte Head 164 USPQ 664 (POBA 1969), In re Zierden, 411 F.2d 1325, 1328, 162 USPQ 102, 104 (CCPA 1969), In re Lemin, 51 CCPA 942, 326 F.2d 437, 140 USPQ 273 (1964), Kropa v. Robie, and Mahlman, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1742

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 06150722 (Table 1, samples 6 and 10 for compositions and Table 2 for IACS) in view of JP 54023031.
- 6. JP 06150722 discloses the features including the claimed Cu base alloys (Table 1, samples 6 and 10 for compositions) and electrical conductivity (Table 2 for IACS) except for the tensile strength. JP 54023031 in abstract discloses electrical conductivity and tensile strength for coated Cu based wire with various optional elements which overlap the Cu based alloy of JP 06150722. As is evinced by JP 54023031 that Cu based wire conductors substantially same as wire conductors of JP 06150722 are known to require tensile strength at least 50 Kg/mm² (472 MPa). Therefore, it is recognized by ordinary skill artisan that the wire conductor would have tensile strength at least 50 Kg/mm² (472 Mpa) and/or know how to obtain the tensile strength by the method as taught by JP 54023031. Accordingly, it would

Art Unit: 1742

have been prima facie obvious for an ordinary skill artisan motivated by a reasonable expectation of success to use the for in order to obtain all of the known benefits. In re Venner, 120 USPQ 193 (CCPA 1958), In re LaVerne, et al., 108 USPQ 335, and In re Aller, et al., 105 USPQ 233.

# Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed July 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 8. Applicants' argument as set forth in 4th full paragraph about JP '722 is noted. The Cu based conductor wire of said reference may be coated but the coating would not affect the electrical conductivity of the core wire.
- 9. Applicants' argument as set forth in page 3, last paragraph of the instant remarks is noted. But, the instant claims are directed to Cu based alloy. The alloys of cited references are for electrical conducting as the recited application. Moreover, reciting the contemplated end-use in a product claim directed to an old compound does not impart thereto the novelty requisite to patentability, even though the end-use is unobvious. In re Thuau 135 F2d 344, 57 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1943).
- 10. Applicants' argument as set forth in page 4, first full paragraph of the instant remarks is noted. But, the Cu based alloys of JP '031 contain so many combinations

Art Unit: 1742

of optional elements which show the tensile strength and electrical conductivity do not affect by cited elements.

#### Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been meet by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06 (a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.119.

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (703) 308-2542.

Art Unit: 1742

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (703)-308-1146.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit 1742 are (703) 305-3601 (Official Paper only) and (703) 305-7719 (Unofficial Paper only). When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

1

SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip October 16, 2003